

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/622,076	07/17/2003	Rudolf Gilmanshin	C0989.70054US00	1842
Helen C. Lockh	7590 11/17/200 art	EXAMINER		
Wolf, Greenfiel Federal Reserve	d & Sacks, P.C.	BERTAGNA, ANGELA MARIE		
600 Atlantic Av		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Boston, MA 02	210	1637		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/17/2008	PAPER

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/622,076	GILMANSHIN, RUDOLF		
Examiner	Art Unit		
ANGELA BERTAGNA	1637		

	ANGELA BENTAGNA	1037	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>04 November 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE f).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol><li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp</li></ol>			
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w <u>AMENDMENTS</u>			e appeal. Since a
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b			cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further con		ΓE below);	
<ul> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo</li> <li>(c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or</li> </ul>	•	ducing or simplifying t	he issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	_		_
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		I be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,2,5-7,9,11-17,19-34,68,91,125,126 ar</u>	nd 128-130.		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	4 b - f - m - cm - m - th - d - th f Clim m - N lo		. h
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
<ul> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ul>	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Kenneth R Horlick/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1637	

Continuation of 3. In the proposed amendment, claims 1, 91, 126, and 129 and have been amended to recite that the method steps occur in a particular order. This limitation has not been previously considered, and therefore, requires further search and consideration. Claims 1, 2, 91, 125, 126, 129, and 130 have also been amended to positively recite that the nucleic acid binding enzyme/agent binds and translocates along the nucleic acid polymer. The binding and translocating step were previously recited using "allowing" language, and therefore, the requirement for acutal binding and translocation rather than just the capability to do so requires further search and consideration. Also, the new limitations recited in lines 10-11 of claim 68 and line 7 of claim 125 have not been previously considered in the context of these claims, and therefore, they require further consideration and searching. Since the proposed amendments to the claims require further search and consideration, they have not been entered.

Continuation of 11. Applicant's arguments filed on November 4, 2008 are directed to the claims as amended. Since the amendment was not entered, these arguments are moot. The claims remain rejected for the reasons set forth in the final rejection mailed on September 4, 2008.